arXiv:hep-ph/9709461v1 25 Sep 1997

LA-UR-97-3795

Schwinger's Nonet Mass Formula Revisited

L. Burakovsky* and T. Goldman†

Theoretical Division, MS B285
Los Alamos National Laboratory
Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA

Abstract

We prove the validity of Schwinger's quartic nonet mass formula for a general nonet structure with the isoscalar singlet mass being shifted from its "ideal" value. We apply this formula to the problem of the correct $q\bar{q}$ assignment for the scalar meson nonet. The results favor scalar isoscalar singlet and isoscalar octet masses in the vicinity of 1 GeV and 1.45 GeV, respectively. We explain the failure of Schwinger's formula for the pseudoscalar meson nonet, and suggest a new version of this formula, modified by the inclusion of the pseudoscalar decay constants, which holds with improved accuracy for this nonet. We also rederive the new Gell-Mann–Okubo mass formula $3M^2(n\bar{n}, I = 1) + 2M^2(s\bar{s}) = 4M^2(s\bar{n}) + M^2(n\bar{n}, I = 0)$ $(n = u, d)$, suggested in our previous publications.

Key words: Schwinger's formula, Gell-Mann–Okubo, chiral Lagrangian, pseudoscalar mesons, scalar mesons
PACS: 12.39.Fe, 12.40.Yx, 12.90.+b, 14.40.Aq, 14.40.Cs

Schwinger's original nonet mass formula [1] (here the symbol for the meson stands for its mass)

$$\left(4K^2 - 3\eta^2 - \pi^2\right)\left(3\eta'^2 + \pi^2 - 4K^2\right) = 8\left(K^2 - \pi^2\right)^2 \tag{1}$$

*E-mail: BURAKOV@PION.LANL.GOV
†E-mail: GOLDMAN@T5.LANL.GOV

relates the masses of the isovector (π), isodoublet (K) and isoscalar mostly octet (η) and mostly singlet ($\eta^{'}$) states of a meson nonet.[1] It is usually derived in the following way:

For the ideal Gell-Mann–Okubo type structure of a nonet, the octet-singlet mass squared matrix is[2]

$$M^2 = \begin{pmatrix} M_{88}^2 & M_{89}^2 \\ M_{89}^2 & M_{99}^2 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} 4K^2 - \pi^2 & -2\sqrt{2}\,(K^2 - \pi^2) \\ -2\sqrt{2}\,(K^2 - \pi^2) & 2K^2 + \pi^2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2}$$

The masses of the physical η and $\eta^{'}$ states are given by diagonalizing the M^2 matrix,

$$M^2 = \begin{pmatrix} \eta^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \eta^{'2} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3}$$

and obtained from the invariance of the trace and determinant under a unitary transformation, namely a rotation in the flavor space. As follows from (2),(3),

$$\mathrm{Tr}\, M^2 = 2K^2 = \eta^2 + \eta^{'2}, \tag{4}$$

$$\mathrm{Det}\, M^2 = \frac{1}{9}\left[\left(4K^2 - \pi^2\right)\left(2K^2 + \pi^2\right) - 8\left(K^2 - \pi^2\right)^2\right] = \eta^2\eta^{'2}. \tag{5}$$

Since, in view of (4),

$$2K^2 + \pi^2 = 6K^2 + \pi^2 - 4K^2 = 3\left(\eta^2 + \eta^{'2}\right) - \left(4K^2 - \pi^2\right),$$

Eq. (5) may be finally cast into the form (1).

For the ideal structure of a nonet, Eq. (2), the octet-singlet mixing angle,

$$\tan 2\theta_{\eta\eta'} = \frac{2M_{89}^2}{M_{99}^2 - M_{88}^2} = 2\sqrt{2}, \tag{6}$$

corresponds to the ideal value $\theta_{\eta\eta'} \cong 35.3^o \equiv \theta_{id}$. With this mixing angle, using the relations

$$\omega_8 = \frac{u\bar{u} + d\bar{d} - 2s\bar{s}}{\sqrt{6}}, \quad \omega_9 = \frac{u\bar{u} + d\bar{d} + s\bar{s}}{\sqrt{3}}, \tag{7}$$

and

$$\omega_\eta = \omega_8 \cos\theta_{\eta\eta'} - \omega_9 \sin\theta_{\eta\eta'},$$
$$\omega_{\eta'} = \omega_8 \sin\theta_{\eta\eta'} + \omega_9 \cos\theta_{\eta\eta'},$$

one finds

$$\omega_\eta = -s\bar{s}, \quad \omega_{\eta'} = \frac{u\bar{u} + d\bar{d}}{\sqrt{2}} \equiv n\bar{n}. \tag{8}$$

[1]Since these designations apply to all spin states, e.g., vector mesons will be confusingly labelled as η's. We ask the reader to bear with us in this in the interest of minimizing notation.

[2]This matrix leads to the Gell-Mann–Okubo values for the masses of the pure $n\bar{n}$ and $s\bar{s}$ states $(n = u, d) : \pi^2$ and $2K^2 - \pi^2$, respectively.

Assuming, as usual, that the relevant matrix elements are equal to the squared masses of the corresponding states, one obtains from Eq. (2) and the above relations [2]

$$\eta^2 = M_{88}^2 \cos^2\theta_{\eta\eta'} + M_{99}^2 \sin^2\theta_{\eta\eta'} - 2M_{89}^2 \sin\theta_{\eta\eta'}\cos\theta_{\eta\eta'} = 2K^2 - \pi^2, \quad (9)$$

$$\eta'^2 = M_{88}^2 \sin^2\theta_{\eta\eta'} + M_{99}^2 \cos^2\theta_{\eta\eta'} + 2M_{89}^2 \sin\theta_{\eta\eta'}\cos\theta_{\eta\eta'} = \pi^2, \quad (10)$$

and

$$M_{\eta\eta'}^2 = \left(M_{88}^2 - M_{99}^2\right)\sin\theta_{\eta\eta'}\cos\theta_{\eta\eta'} + M_{89}^2(\cos^2\theta_{\eta\eta'} - \sin^2\theta_{\eta\eta'}) = 0, \quad (11)$$

in agreement with (3).

It is easily seen that η and η' defined in (9),(10) solve Schwinger's nonet formula (1). Moreover, (9) and (10) are the unique solution of Eqs. (1) and (4). Therefore, Schwinger's nonet mass formula is closely related to the ideal structure of a nonet: the former has a solution in the form of the latter, while the latter leads directly to the former, as we have demonstrated by Eqs. (2)-(5) above. Indeed, Schwinger's formula is known to hold with a high accuracy for, e.g., the vector and tensor multiplets which are almost ideally mixed, but it does not hold for the pseudoscalar multiplet. It is well known that the pseudoscalar (and, probably, scalar) multiplet does not have the ideal structure, since the mass of the pseudoscalar isoscalar singlet state is shifted up from its "ideal" value of $(2K^2 + \pi^2)/3$ (in view of (2)), presumably by the instanton-induced 't Hooft interaction [3] which breaks axial U(1) symmetry [4, 5, 6].

Eq. (4) therefore does not hold for the pseudoscalar multiplet, and thus the ideal structure of this multiplet is broken. This might be considered as the reason for the failure of Schwinger's nonet relation for the pseudoscalar mesons. Indeed, with the measured pseudoscalar meson masses, Eq. (1) gives (in GeV^2) 0.12 on the l.h.s. vs. 0.41 on the r.h.s.. Similarly, according to refs. [5, 7], for the scalar multiplet, the same instanton-induced interaction shifts the mass of the scalar isoscalar singlet down from the "ideal" value provided by Eq. (2) (by the same amount as the pseudoscalar isoscalar singlet is increased [5]), and therefore Eq. (4) does not hold for the scalar multiplet, breaking its ideal structure as well. Thus, Schwinger's formula may not hold for the scalar mesons either. However, this can be neither confirmed nor refuted, as long as the scalar meson spectrum remains unknown, except for the scalar isodoublet state $K_0^*(1430)$.

In this letter we examine a more general structure of a meson nonet than the ideal one, Eq. (2), viz., the structure with the mass of the isoscalar singlet shifted from its "ideal" value given in (2),[3]

$$M_{99}^2 = \frac{1}{3}\left(2K^2 + \pi^2\right) + A, \quad (12)$$

where A is some constant, with the dimension of mass squared, either positive or negative (the case $A = 0$ corresponds to the ideal structure, Eq. (2)). We show that for this structure, Schwinger's nonet formula remains valid. Hence, this formula

[3]We assume that the mass of the isoscalar octet remains in accordance with the Gell-Mann–Okubo mass formula [8] $3M_{88}^2 = 4K^2 - \pi^2$.

should hold for every meson nonet (including the pseudoscalar one), and, in particular, since it holds for the scalar nonet, it may be applied to the problem of the correct $q\bar{q}$ assignment for this nonet, which we do below. We show how Eq. (1) must be altered for the pseudoscalar mesons, and present a new form of this relation, which holds for the pseudoscalar mesons with improved accuracy.

We start with the general "non-ideal" nonet form which follows from (12):

$$M^2 = \begin{pmatrix} M_{88}^2 & M_{89}^2 \\ M_{89}^2 & M_{99}^2 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} 4K^2 - \pi^2 & -2\sqrt{2}\,(K^2 - \pi^2) \\ -2\sqrt{2}\,(K^2 - \pi^2) & 2K^2 + \pi^2 + 3A \end{pmatrix}. \tag{13}$$

For the pseudoscalar mesons, this structure is reproduced by several different QCD-inspired models. For example, the observed mass splitting among the pseudoscalar nonet may be induced by the following symmetry breaking terms [4],

$$L_m^{(0)} = \frac{f^2}{4} \left(B\ \mathrm{Tr}\, M \left(U + U^\dagger \right) + \frac{\varepsilon}{6N_c} \left[\mathrm{Tr} \left(\ln U - \ln U^\dagger \right) \right]^2 \right), \tag{14}$$

with M being the quark mass matrix,

$$M = \mathrm{diag}\,(m_u,\ m_d,\ m_s) = m_s\ \mathrm{diag}\,(x, y, 1), \quad x \equiv \frac{m_u}{m_s},\ y \equiv \frac{m_d}{m_s}, \tag{15}$$

N_c the number of colors, and $B, \varepsilon = \mathrm{const}$, in addition to the $\mathrm{U}(3)_L \times \mathrm{U}(3)_R$ invariant non-linear Lagrangian

$$L^{(0)} = \frac{f^2}{4}\ \mathrm{Tr} \left(\partial_\mu U \partial^\mu U^\dagger \right), \tag{16}$$

with

$$U = \exp(i\pi/f), \quad \pi \equiv \lambda_a \pi^a, \ \ a = 0, 1, \ldots, 8,$$

which incorporates the constraints of current algebra for the light pseudoscalars π^a [9]. As pointed out in ref. [10], chiral corrections can be important, the kaon mass being half the typical 1 GeV chiral symmetry breaking scale. Such large corrections are clearly required from the study of the octet-singlet mass squared matrix M^2. In the isospin limit $x = y$ one has [11]

$$M^2 = B \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{3}(2m_s + m_n) & \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3}(m_n - m_s) \\ \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3}(m_n - m_s) & \frac{2}{3}(m_s + 2m_n) + \frac{\varepsilon}{BN_c} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{17}$$

which reduces, through the Gell-Mann–Oakes-Renner relations (to first order in chiral symmetry breaking) [12] which we discuss in more detail below,

$$\begin{aligned} m_\pi^2 &= 2B\, m_n, \\ m_K^2 &= B\,(m_s + m_n), \\ m_\eta^2 &= \frac{2}{3} B\,(2m_s + m_n), \quad m_n \equiv \frac{m_u + m_d}{2}, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

to

$$M^2 = \frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} 4K^2 - \pi^2 & -2\sqrt{2}\,(K^2 - \pi^2) \\ -2\sqrt{2}\,(K^2 - \pi^2) & 2K^2 + \pi^2 + 3A \end{pmatrix}, \quad A \equiv \frac{\varepsilon}{BN_c}. \tag{19}$$

Also, the Nambu–Jona-Lasinio model with the instanton-induced 't Hooft interaction, initiated by Hatsuda and Kunihiro [13] and Bernard *et al.* [14], and then extensively studied by Dmitrasinovic [5, 6], provides shifts of both the pseudoscalar and scalar isoscalar singlet masses by the same amount but in opposite directions (viz., the pseudoscalar isoscalar singlet mass is increased, while the scalar one is decreased). Thus, for the pseudoscalar mesons, A in (12) may be considered as the sum of all possible contributions to the shift of the isoscalar singlet mass (from instanton effects, $1/N_c$-expansion diagrams, gluon annihilation diagrams, etc.).

Let us first calculate the masses of the pure $n\bar{n}$ and $s\bar{s}$ states (which we now designate as η_n and η_s, respectively). By rotating the ω_8 and ω_9 states in the flavor space by θ_{id} and using the relations (9)-(11), one obtains from (12),

$$\eta_s^2 = 2K^2 - \pi^2 + \frac{A}{3}, \tag{20}$$

$$\eta_n^2 = \pi^2 + \frac{2A}{3}, \tag{21}$$

$$M^2_{\eta_n\eta_s} = -\frac{A\sqrt{2}}{3}. \tag{22}$$

It is seen that with $A \neq 0$, the mass matrix

$$M^2 = \begin{pmatrix} \eta_s^2 & M^2_{\eta_n\eta_s} \\ M^2_{\eta_n\eta_s} & \eta_n^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

contains off-diagonal elements, i.e., the $n\bar{n}$ and $s\bar{s}$ states are not the eigenfunctions of this matrix anymore. Indeed, the octet-singlet mixing angle obtained from (13) is

$$\tan 2\theta_{\eta\eta'} = \frac{2M^2_{89}}{M^2_{99} - M^2_{88}} = 2\sqrt{2}\left(1 - \frac{3A}{2(K^2 - \pi^2)}\right)^{-1}, \tag{23}$$

and only with $A = 0$ does this reduce to the ideal value (6).[4] Thus, it follows clearly that the isoscalar states of a nonet which has the "non-ideal" structure, Eq. (12), cannot be pure $n\bar{n}$ and $s\bar{s}$. This is the case realized for the pseudoscalar and scalar multiplets.

It follows from (20),(21) that

$$2\eta_s^2 + 3\pi^2 = 4K^2 + \eta_n^2, \tag{24}$$

which is the new Gell-Mann–Okubo mass formula which we proposed in a previous paper [17]. For $A = 0$ and $\eta_n = \eta'$, $\eta_s = \eta$ given in (9),(10), Eq. (24) reduces to the Sakurai mass formula [18]

$$2\eta_s^2 + \pi^2 + \eta_n^2 = 4K^2, \tag{25}$$

[4]For the pseudoscalar mesons, the parameter A is determined by the trace condition (26): $A = \eta^2 + \eta'^2 - 2K^2 \simeq 0.725$ GeV^2; one then obtains from (23) the mixing angle $\theta_{\eta\eta'} \simeq -19^o$, in agreement with most of experimental data [15, 16].

which may be obtained from (2),(6) [17, 19]. As is clear from its derivation, the formula (24) has more generality than (25), since it holds for the more general "non-ideal" nonet structure, Eq. (12), in contrast to (25) which is valid only for the ideal nonet structure alone, Eq. (2).

The eigenvalues of the mass matrix (13), η^2 and $\eta^{'2}$ (the latter stands for the mostly singlet isoscalar), can be again obtained from the two matrix invariants:

$$\mathrm{Tr}\, M^2 = 2K^2 + A = \eta^2 + \eta^{'2}, \tag{26}$$

$$\mathrm{Det}\, M^2 = \frac{1}{9}\left[\left(4K^2 - \pi^2\right)\left(2K^2 + \pi^2 + 3A\right) - 8\left(K^2 - \pi^2\right)^2\right] = \eta^2\eta^{'2}. \tag{27}$$

By eliminating A from these two relations, one again arrives at Eq. (1). We conclude, therefore, that Schwinger's nonet mass formula is a universal result of meson spectroscopy, as well as the new Gell-Mann–Okubo mass formula (24); both hold for a more general ("non-ideal") structure of a meson nonet.

We now wish to apply Schwinger's nonet relation (1) to the problem of the correct $q\bar{q}$ assignment for the scalar meson nonet. Except for the well established scalar isodoublet state, $K_0^*(1430)$, the masses of the true scalar states are unknown [20]. There are three experimental candidates for the scalar isovector state, the well-established $a_0(980)$, which is however interpreted mainly as a $K\bar{K}$ molecule [21], and the two states which need experimental confirmation, $a_0(1320)$ and $a_0(1450)$, seen by GAMS [22] and LASS [23], and the Crystal Barrel [24], respectively, which may well be manifestations of one state having a mass of ~ 1400 MeV.

We solve the equations (26),(27) for the scalar isoscalar states, using the masses of the isodoublet (1429 MeV) and isovector states, for each of the three isovector candidates discussed above: 983.5 MeV, 1322 ± 30 MeV, and 1450 ± 40 MeV, respectively. Keeping in mind that the shift of the scalar isoscalar singlet down from its "ideal" value is of the same magnitude but opposite in sign to that of the pseudoscalar isoscalar singlet [5], we use

$$\bar{A} \cong -\left[\left(\frac{f_\eta}{f_\pi}\right)^2 \eta^2 + \left(\frac{f_{\eta'}}{f_\pi}\right)^2 \eta^{'2} - 2\left(\frac{f_K}{f_\pi}\right)^2 K^2\right] \simeq -1\ \mathrm{GeV}^2, \tag{28}$$

as follows from Eqs. (40),(45) below.

Our results are shown in Table I.

We consider the solution for the $a_0(980)$ taken as the scalar isovector state to be doubtful, on the basis of the following simple argument: For this solution, the mass interval occupied by the scalar nonet turns out to be wider than 1 GeV, a typical mass scale of light meson spectroscopy. However, we note that it does afford the most economical solution [$f_0(1700)$ and $f_0^{'}(500)$] provided one accepts the arguments of Kisslinger [25], Törnqvist [26], and Ishida *et al.* [27], regarding the existence of a scalar state in the region of 500 MeV.

For $a_0 = 1390 \pm 100$ MeV, to accommodate the remaining two candidates for the scalar isovector state, $a_0(1320)$ and $a_0(1450)$, we have the solution

$$f_0 = 1462 \pm 42\ \mathrm{MeV}, \quad f_0^{'} = 971 \pm 64\ \mathrm{MeV}, \tag{29}$$

which strongly favors the $f_0(1500)$ and $f_0(980)$ states of the Particle Data Group [20], with masses 1503 ± 11 MeV and 980 ± 10 MeV, as the candidates for the scalar isoscalar octet and singlet states, respectively.

a_0, MeV	f_0, MeV	$f_0^{'}$, MeV
983.5	1694	463
1290	1504	907
1320	1485	937
1350	1467	966
1380	1450	990
1410	1436	1011
1450	1423	1029
1490	1419	1035

Table I. Predictions for the masses of the scalar isoscalar mesons for different values of the a_0 meson mass, according to Eqs. (20),(21). The values of A and the K_0^* meson mass used in the calculation are $A = 1$ GeV^2, $K_0^* = 1429$ MeV.

We next explain the inapplicability of Schwinger's formula (1) for the pseudoscalar meson nonet, and suggest its proper modification for this nonet.

It was shown by Bramon [28] that duality constraints for the set of scattering processes $\pi\eta \to \pi\eta$, $\pi\eta \to \pi\eta^{'}$, $\pi\eta^{'} \to \pi\eta^{'}$, $\eta K \to (\pi, \eta, \eta^{'})K$, and $\eta\eta \to \eta\eta$, $\eta\eta^{'} \to \eta\eta^{'}$, $\eta^{'}\eta^{'} \to \eta^{'}\eta^{'}$, provide the value for the η-$\eta^{'}$ mixing angle

$$\theta_{\eta\eta'} = -\arctan\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \approx -19.5^o, \tag{30}$$

in good agreement with experiment [15, 16]. As shown in our previous paper [17], with this value of the η-$\eta^{'}$ mixing angle, the formula (24) reduces to

$$\eta^{'2} = 4K^2 - 3\pi^2, \tag{31}$$

which is satisfied to 1% with the measured pseudoscalar meson masses. The same value (30), on being used in Eq. (23), leads, through (26), to

$$A = \eta^2 + \eta^{'2} - 2K^2 = 3\left(K^2 - \pi^2\right), \tag{32}$$

which is satisfied to $\sim 6\%$: (in GeV^2) 0.72 on the l.h.s. vs. 0.68 on the r.h.s.. However, Eqs. (31) and (32) give

$$\eta = K, \tag{33}$$

which is satisfied only to $\sim 10\%$. The reason for such poor accuracy of Eq. (33) (as well as Schwinger's formula (1) for the pseudoscalar nonet which has the solution $\eta^{'2} = 4K^2 - 3\pi^2$, $\eta^2 = K^2$, as easily checked by using these expressions in Eq. (1)), is the absence of the pseudoscalar decay constants from Eqs. (31)-(33), and preceeding

relations (19) and (23). Indeed, the Gell-Mann–Oakes-Renner formulas relate the pseudoscalar masses and decay constants to the quark masses and condensates [12]:

$$\pi^2 f_\pi^2 = -\left[m_u\langle\bar{u}u\rangle + m_d\langle\bar{d}d\rangle\right], \tag{34}$$

$$\left(K^\pm\right)^2 f_K^2 = -\left[m_u\langle\bar{u}u\rangle + m_s\langle\bar{s}s\rangle\right], \tag{35}$$

$$\left(K^0\right)^2 f_K^2 = -\left[m_d\langle\bar{d}d\rangle + m_s\langle\bar{s}s\rangle\right]. \tag{36}$$

In the limit of exact nonet symmetry,

$$f_\pi = f_K = f_{88} = f_{99} \equiv f, \quad \langle\bar{u}u\rangle = \langle\bar{d}d\rangle = \langle\bar{s}s\rangle \equiv \langle\bar{q}q\rangle, \tag{37}$$

one has the mass matrix (17) with $B = -\langle\bar{q}q\rangle/f^2$, which further reduces to (19). When the first of the relations (37) is broken, which is known to occur in the real world, but the second one remains (approximately) satisfied, one will have, from (17) and (34)-(36),

$$M^2 = \frac{1}{3f^2}\begin{pmatrix} 4f_K^2K^2 - f_\pi^2\pi^2 & -2\sqrt{2}\,(f_K^2K^2 - f_\pi^2\pi^2) \\ -2\sqrt{2}\,(f_K^2K^2 - f_\pi^2\pi^2) & 2f_K^2K^2 + f_\pi^2\pi^2 + 3f_{99}^2A \end{pmatrix}, \tag{38}$$

$$K^2 \equiv \frac{(K^\pm)^2 + (K^0)^2}{2}.$$

It then follows from (38), by repeating the considerations which lead to Eqs. (31)-(33) above, and assuming the validity of Eq. (30), that Eqs. (31)-(33) should now be replaced, respectively, by

$$\left(\frac{f_{\eta'}}{f}\right)^2 \eta'^2 = 4\left(\frac{f_K}{f}\right)^2 K^2 - 3\left(\frac{f_\pi}{f}\right)^2 \pi^2, \tag{39}$$

$$\left(\frac{f_{99}}{f}\right)^2 A = \left(\frac{f_\eta}{f}\right)^2 \eta^2 + \left(\frac{f_{\eta'}}{f}\right)^2 \eta'^2 - 2\left(\frac{f_K}{f}\right)^2 K^2 = 3\left[\left(\frac{f_K}{f}\right)^2 K^2 - \left(\frac{f_\pi}{f}\right)^2 \pi^2\right], \tag{40}$$

$$\left(\frac{f_\eta}{f}\right)^2 \eta^2 = \left(\frac{f_K}{f}\right)^2 K^2. \tag{41}$$

These relations allow us to determine the ratios f_η/f_π, $f_{\eta'}/f_\pi$, and the values of f_η, $f_{\eta'}$, using f_K/f_π and f_π as input parameters.

As follows from the relations [20]

$$\sqrt{2}f_K = 159.8 \pm 1.6 \text{ MeV}, \quad \sqrt{2}f_\pi = 130.7 \pm 0.3 \text{ MeV}, \quad \frac{f_K}{f_\pi} = 1.22 \pm 0.01 \tag{42}$$

and Eqs. (39),(41),

$$\frac{f_{\eta'}}{f_\pi} = \left[\left(\frac{f_K}{f_\pi}\right)^2 \left(\frac{K}{\eta'}\right)^2 - 3\left(\frac{\pi}{\eta'}\right)^2\right]^{1/2} = 1.24 \pm 0.015, \quad f_{\eta'} = 114.5 \pm 1.5 \text{ MeV}, \tag{43}$$

$$\frac{f_\eta}{f_\pi} = \frac{f_K}{f_\pi}\,\frac{K}{\eta} = 1.105 \pm 0.015, \quad f_\eta = 102 \pm 1.5 \text{ MeV}. \tag{44}$$

Both (43) and (44) are in good agreement with the value provided by the analysis of experimental data by Gilman and Kauffman [15]: $f_\eta = f_{\eta'} = 110 \pm 10$ MeV.

Eq. (40), with the relation $f_{99}/f_\pi = 1.04 \pm 0.04$ obtained from both the analysis of experimental $\gamma\gamma$ widths [15] and chiral perturbation theory [29], leads to

$$A = 3\left[\left(\frac{f_K}{f_\pi}\right)^2\left(\frac{f_\pi}{f_{99}}\right)^2 K^2 - \left(\frac{f_\pi}{f_{99}}\right)^2 \pi^2\right] = 0.97 \pm 0.10 \text{ GeV}^2 \approx 1 \text{ GeV}^2, \tag{45}$$

which is the value we have used in the analysis of the scalar meson spectrum above.

Finally, repeating in the case of the pseudoscalar mesons the analysis of a nonet with the "non-ideal" structure, Eq. (13), which leads to the derivation of Schwinger's formula (1), one arrives at the following modification of this formula:

$$\left(4f_K^2K^2 - 3f_\eta^2\eta^2 - f_\pi^2\pi^2\right)\left(3f_{\eta'}^2\eta'^2 + f_\pi^2\pi^2 - 4f_K^2K^2\right) = 8\left(f_K^2K^2 - f_\pi^2\pi^2\right)^2, \tag{46}$$

which we refer to as "Schwinger's nonet mass formula revisited". With the measured pseudoscalar meson masses, and the decay constants (42)-(44), it gives (in 10^{-6} GeV^4)

$$70 \pm 7 \text{ on the l.h.s vs. } 70 \pm 3 \text{ on the r.h.s},$$

i.e., it holds with a high accuracy for the pseudoscalar meson nonet. The uncertainty of Eq. (46) is directly related to the uncertainties of Eqs. (42)-(44). It is also clear that

$$f_{\eta'}^2\eta'^2 = 4f_K^2K^2 - 3f_\pi^2\pi^2, \quad f_\eta^2\eta^2 = f_K^2K^2, \tag{47}$$

as follows from (39),(41), is a solution to Eq. (46).

It has been suggested in the literature that the pseudoscalar decay constants should enter relations like (39)-(41) in the first rather than second power [30]. As we will show in a separate publication [31], the form of a relation of the type (39)-(41), containing the pseudoscalar decay constants squared, is the only one which remains exact in the first nonleading order of chiral perturbation theory, while, e.g., the standard Gell-Mann–Okubo mass formula gets a correction already in this order.

Let us briefly summarize the findings of this work:

i) We have shown that both the new quadratic Gell-Mann–Okubo formula (24) and Schwinger's quartic formula (1) hold for a more general "non-ideal" structure of a meson nonet, with the isoscalar singlet mass shifted from its "ideal" value.

ii) We have found a new version of Schwinger's formula for the pseudoscalar meson nonet, Eq. (46), which differs from the original relation (1) by the inclusion of the pseudoscalar decay constants, and holds with a high accuracy for this nonet.

iii) Under the assumption that the η-η' mixing angle $\approx -19.5^o$, in agreement with experiment, we obtained the pseudoscalar isoscalar decay constants $f_\eta = 102 \pm 1.5$ MeV, $f_{\eta'} = 114.5 \pm 1.5$ MeV.

iv) We have applied Schwinger's nonet mass formula to the problem of the correct $q\bar{q}$ assignment for the scalar meson nonet. Our results favor the $f_0(1500)$ and $f_0(980)$

mesons as the candidates for the scalar isoscalar mostly octet and mostly singlet states, respectively.

References

[1] J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **12** (1964) 237

[2] D.H. Perkins, *Introduction to High Energy Physics,* 3rd ed., (Addison Wesley, Reading, MA, 1987), section 5.6

[3] G. 't Hooft, Phys. Rev. D **14** (1976) 3432, **18** (1978) 2199E

[4] C. Rosenzweig, J. Schechter and C.G. Trahern, Phys. Rev. D **21** (1980) 3388
P. Di Vecchia and G. Veneziano, Nucl. Phys. B **171** (1980) 253
E. Witten, Ann. Phys. **128** (1980) 363

[5] V. Dmitrasinovic, Phys. Rev. C **53** (1996) 1383

[6] V. Dmitrasinovic, Phys. Rev. D **56** (1997) 247

[7] E. Klempt, B.C. Metsch, C.R. Münz and H.R. Petry, Phys. Lett. B **361** (1995) 160
C. Ritter, B.C. Metsch, C.R. Münz and H.R. Petry, Phys. Lett. B **380** (1996) 431

[8] S. Okubo, Prog. Theor. Phys. **27** (1962) 949, **28** (1962) 24
M. Gell-Mann and Y. Ne'eman, *The Eightfold Way,* (Benjamin, NY, 1964)

[9] H. Georgi, *Weak Interactions and Modern Particle Theory,* (Benjamin, New York, 1984)

[10] D.B. Kaplan and A.V. Manohar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56** (1986) 2004

[11] J.F. Donoghue, E. Golowich and B.R. Holstein, *Dynamics of the Standard Model,* (Cambridge University Press, 1996), Chapter X

[12] M. Gell-Mann, R.J. Oakes and B. Renner, Phys. Rev. **175** (1968) 2195

[13] T. Hatsuda and T. Kunihiro, Phys. Lett. B **206** (1988) 385, erratum: *ibid.* **210** (1988) 278; Z. Phys. C **51** (1991) 49; Phys. Rep. **247** (1994) 221

[14] V. Bernanrd, R.L. Jaffe and U.-G. Meissner, Nucl. Phys. B **308** (1988) 753

[15] F.J. Gilman and R. Kauffman, Phys. Rev. D **36** (1987) 2761

[16] Crystal Barrel Collaboration (C. Amsler *et al.,*) Phys. Lett. B **294** (1992) 451
P. Ball, J.-M. Frere and M. Tytgat, Phys. Lett. B **365** (1996) 367
A. Bramon, R. Escribano and M.D. Scadron, Phys. Lett. B **403** (1997) 339

[17] L. Burakovsky and T. Goldman, Gell-Mann–Okubo mass formula revisited, Report LA-UR-97-3597 [hep-ph/9708498], to be published

[18] J.J. Sakurai, *Currents and Mesons,* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1969)

[19] L. Burakovsky and L.P. Horwitz, Found. Phys. Lett. **9** (1996) 561

[20] Particle Data Group, Phys. Rev. D **54** (1996) 1

[21] J. Weinstein and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D **41** (1990) 2236
G. Janssen, B.C. Pierce, K. Holinde and J. Speth, Phys. Rev. D **52** (1995) 2690

[22] M. Boutemeur, in *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Hadron Spectroscopy,* Hadron '89, Ajaccio, France, 1989; ed. F. Binon *et al.,* Editions Frontieres (Gif-sur-Yvette) **C29** (1990) 119

[23] D. Aston *et al.,* Nucl. Phys. B **301** (1988) 525

[24] C. Amsler *et al.,* Phys. Lett. B **333** (1994) 277

[25] L. Kisslinger, Sigma signal for hybrid baryon decay, hep-ph/9709xxx

[26] N.A. Törnqvist, Z. Phys. C **68** (1995) 647
N.A. Törnqvist and M. Roos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76** (1996) 1575

[27] S. Ishida *et al.,* Prog. Theor. Phys. **95** (1996) 745

[28] A. Bramon, Phys. Lett. B **51** (1974) 87

[29] J.F. Donoghue, B.R. Holstein and Y.-C.R. Lin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55** (1985) 2766

[30] G. Cicogna, F. Strocchi and R. Vergara Caffarelli, Phys. Rev. D **6** (1972) 301
T.N. Tiwari, C.V. Sastry and S. Sharma, Indian J. Pure Appl. Phys. **21** (1983) 425

[31] L. Burakovsky and T. Goldman, in preparation